| 1 | CHRISTOPHER A. NEDEAU (CA SBN 81297) | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--|
| 2 | CARL L. BLUMENSTEIN (CA SBN 124158) NOSSAMAN LLP | | |
| | 50 California Street, 34 th Floor | | |
| 3 | San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 398-3600 | | |
| 4 | Facsimile: (415) 398-2438 | | |
| 5 | cnedeau@nossaman.com cblumenstein@nossaman.com | | |
| 6 | Attorneys for Defendants | | |
| | AU Optronics Corporation and | | |
| 7 | AU Optronics Corporation America | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 9 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION | | |
| 10 | | | |
| | | | |
| 11 | IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) | Master File No. 3:07-md-1827 SI | |
| 12 | ANTITRUST LITIGATION | MDL No. 1827 | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: | STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] | |
| | AT&T Mobility LLC et al v. AU Optronics | RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER REGARDING AUO PROPOSED | |
| 15 | Corporation, et al., Case No. 09-cv-4997 | EXPERT WITNESSES | |
| 16 | Best Buy Co., Inc., et al. v. AU Optronics | | |
| 17 | Corporation, et al., Case No. 10-cv-4572 | | |
| 18 | Costco Wholesale Corporation v. AU | | |
| | Optronics Corporation, et al., Case No. 11-cv-0058 | | |
| 19 | Dell Inc. et al. v. Sharp Corporation, et al., | | |
| 20 | Case No. 10-cv-1064 | | |
| 21 | Eastman Kodak Company v. Epson Imaging | | |
| 22 | Devices Corporation, et al., | | |
| | Case No. 10-cv-5452 | | |
| 23 | Electrograph Systems, Inc., et al. v. | | |
| 24 | Epson Imaging Devices Corp., et al., Case No. 10-cv-0117 | | |
| 25 | Motorola, Inc. v. AU Optronics Corporation, | | |
| 26 | et al., Case No. 09-cv-5840 | | |
| | (continued on next page) | | |
| 27 | | • | |
| 20 | | | |

Case No. 3:07-md-1827 SI

Target Corp. et al. v. AU Optronics Corporation, et al., Case No. 10-cv-4945

TracFone Wireless, Inc. v. AU Optronics Corporation, et al., Case No. 10-cv-3205

State of Missouri, et al. v. AU Optronics Corporation, et al., Case No. 10-cv-3619

State of Florida v. AU Optronics Corporation, et al., Case No. 10-cv-3517

The undersigned Direct Action Plaintiffs and State Attorney Generals ("Plaintiffs") and Defendants AU Optronics Corporation and AU Optronics Corporation America (collectively, "AUO") hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS AUO intends to call certain expert witnesses to testify in its defense in the action entitled *United States v. AU Optronics Corp., et al.*, Case No. CR-09-0110 (SI) (hereafter "the Criminal Case") and seeks to call some of those same expert witnesses (hereafter "Proposed Expert Witnesses"), or some of them, to testify in the above-captioned actions;

WHEREAS the parties seek to make mutually agreeable and orderly arrangements for discovery of the Proposed Expert Witnesses and their proposed testimony, such arrangements to be scheduled later than the deadlines set forth in the Order re: Pretrial and Trial Schedule (Dkt. 2165) and the Stipulation and Order Modifying Pretrial Schedule for "Track One" Direct Action Plaintiff and State Attorney General Cases, filed July 14, 2011 (Dkt. No. 3110);

WHEREAS, AUO on November 3, 2011 disclosed the Proposed Expert Witnesses, among others, on whose expert testimony it intends to rely in the above-captioned actions;

NOW, THEREFORE, Plaintiffs and AUO, through their undersigned liaison counsel and counsel, stipulate and request that the Special Master recommend as follows:

1. This Stipulated Recommendation and Order pertains only to proposed experts
Dayle Carlson, Dr. Thomas Gold, Dr. Doug Guthrie, Dr. Robert Hall, Dr. Larry Samuelson, Dr.
Richard Schmalensee and Ross Young (hereafter, "Proposed Expert Witnesses"). Within 60
days after the Proposed Expert Witness testifies in the Criminal Case (or within 60 days after the
Court enters an order excluding the testimony), and so long as the Plaintiffs' experts have

Case No. 3:07-md-1827 SI

already disclosed their reports, AUO will produce the expert's Rule 26 civil disclosures to
Plaintiffs in accordance with the Federal Rules and this Court's prior orders governing expert
disclosures. So long as Plaintiffs' experts have already given depositions, depositions of the
Proposed Expert Witnesses will be scheduled in San Francisco within 45 days after the reports
are produced, unless Plaintiffs determine in their sole discretion that a later date would be more
appropriate.

- 2. Plaintiffs shall designate rebuttal experts, if any, and produce their Rule 26 disclosures within six weeks after the report of each Proposed Expert Witness is received, but in any event no later than 14 days before trial. Plaintiffs need not duplicate material already disclosed in prior reports or depositions given by their experts; all prior reports and deposition testimony of Plaintiffs' experts shall be deemed offered in rebuttal of AUO's Proposed Expert Witnesses to the extent they are relevant. Irrespective of whether the Plaintiffs' experts produce any new reports in response to the reports of the Proposed Expert Witnesses, Plaintiffs' experts can offer testimony at trial critiquing AUO's experts and their analysis. If the Plaintiffs rely on new experts, those experts shall produce reports and shall be deposed.
- 3. With regard to the reports and depositions anticipated by Paragraphs 1 and 2, the parties will meet and confer in good faith an effort to expedite the process, including consideration of whether certain reports or depositions can be eliminated. Both parties will cooperate informally in providing information about the underlying data and analyses used in the reports.
- 4. Unless explicitly stated, nothing in this Stipulation and Order is intended to modify any other Order of the Court or the Special Master, including without limitation the Order re: Pretrial and Trial Schedule filed Nov. 23, 2010 (Dkt. no. 2165 and 2165-1), nor does this Order prevent any party from seeking further modifications to that or any other Order.

25 ///

26 ///

27 | ///

Case 3:10-cv-03205-SI Document 55 Filed 11/23/11 Page 4 of 5

| | 1 | |
|----|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | 7 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 2011 | NOGG (NANTAY 7) |
| 2 | Dated: November 17, 2011 | NOSSAMAN LLP |
| 3 | | By: <u>/s/ Carl L. Blumenstein</u> Carl L. Blumenstein |
| 4 | | Attorneys for Defendants |
| 5 | | AU Optronics Corporation and AU Optronics Corporation America |
| 6 | | |
| | Dated: November 17, 2011 | CROWELL & MORING LLP |
| 7 | | By: <u>/s/ Jerome Murphy</u> Jerome Murphy |
| 8 | | Liaison Counsel for Direct Action Plaintiffs |
| 9 | D . 1 37 1 17 2011 | |
| 10 | Dated: November 17, 2011 | STATE OF FLORIDA |
| 11 | | By: <u>/s/ Lizabeth Brady</u> Lizabeth Brady |
| 12 | | Office of the Attorney General, State of Florida PL-0 1, The Capitol |
| 13 | | Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050 |
| 14 | | Counsel for Plaintiff State of Florida |
| 15 | Dated: November 17, 2011 | STATE OF MISSOURI |
| | | By:/s/_Anne E. Schneider |
| 16 | | Anne E. Schneider Assistant Attorney General/Antitrust Counsel |
| 17 | | Missouri Attorney General Office P. O. Box 899 |
| 18 | · | Jefferson City, MO 65102 |
| 19 | | Counsel for Plaintiff State of Missouri |
| 20 | Dated: November 17, 2011 | STATE OF ARKANSAS |
| 21 | | By:/s/ David A. Curran |
| 22 | | David A. Curran Assistant Attorney General |
| 23 | | Arkansas Attorney General Office 323 Center Street, Suite 500 |
| 24 | | Little Rock, AR 72201 |
| 25 | | Counsel for Plaintiff State of Arkansas |
| | | (Signatures continued on next page) |
| 26 | | · |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | 264071 2 DOC | Case No. 3:07-md-1827 SI |

264071 2.DOC - 4 - MDL No. 1827
STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER REGARDING AUO PROPOSED EXPERT WITNESSES

Case 3:10-cv-03205-SI Document 55 Filed 11/23/11 Page 5 of 5

| | i e | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Dated: November 17, 2011 | STATE OF MICHIGAN | |
| 2 | | By: /s/ M. Elizabeth Lippitt | |
| 3 | | M. Elizabeth Lippitt Assistant Attorney General | |
| _ | | Michigan Attorney General Office | |
| 4 | · | Corporate Oversight Division 525 West Ottawa Street, 6th Floor | |
| 5 | | Lansing, MI 48933 | |
| 6 | | Counsel for Plaintiff State of Michigan | |
| 7 | Dated: November 17, 2011 | STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA | |
| 8 | · | By: /s/ Douglas L. Davis | |
| 9 | | Douglas L. Davis Assistant Attorney General | |
| 9 | | West Virginia Attorney General Office | |
| 10 | | 812 Quarrier Street, First Floor | |
| 11 | | Charleston, WV 25301 Counsel for Plaintiff State of West Virginia | |
| 1 | | Counselfor I turnity state of West Virginia | |
| 12 | Dated: November 17, 2011 | STATE OF WISCONSIN | |
| 13 | ,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | |
| 14 | | By: /s/ Gwendolyn J. Cooley Gwendolyn J. Cooley | |
| | | Assistant Attorney General | |
| 15 | | Wisconsin Department of Justice PO Box 7857 | |
| 16 | · | Madison, WI 53707 | |
| | | Counsel for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | Attestation: Pursuant to General Order 45, Part X-B, the filer attests that concurrence in | | |
| 19 | the filing of this document has been obtaine | d from each of the signatories. | |
| 20 | IT IS SO RECOMMENDED. | | |
| 21 | | $\langle h, ad \rangle$ | |
| | Dated://\frac{1}{\sqrt{0}}//// | Man Calm | |
| 22 | , , | Martin Quinn Special Master | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | |
| 25 | Dated: | Juran Delaton | |
| | | The Honorable Susan Illston | |
| 26 | | United States District Judge | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | , | |

2071 2.DOC - 5 - MDL No. 1827
STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER REGARDING AUO PROPOSED EXPERT WITNESSES

Case No. 3:07-md-1827 SI